

March 29, 1973

(Start Belt #6)

CLERK: Mr. President the amendment is as follows: (read).

PRESIDENT: Senator Duis did you care to be recognized?

SENATOR DUIS: Yes, I was going to check with Senator Carstens, do we or do we not have another bill in this time that gives the right of banks making deposits in savings and loan associations other than this one?

PRESIDENT: Senator Carstens.

SENATOR DUIS: Something is ringing -

SENATOR CARSTENS: Senator Duis, I don't recall that it was contained in any other bill.

SENATOR DUIS: Something came through my mind that there was. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Murphy, did you wish to be recognized on the Carstens amendment here? The reason we are delaying a little bit, is that Senator Luedtke came in late and he is looking over the amendment.

SENATOR MURPHY: I wonder if possibly Senator Duis is referring to Senator Savage's bill, relative to S&L's. He might find, he might refresh his thought possibly, that is what he has in mind.

PRESIDENT: Thank you Senator Murphy. Is there any further discussion then of Senator Carstens amendment to the Standing Committee amendment? Well, any further discussion of the Carstens amendment, all those in favor of the amendment please signify by saying, we'd better vote on it then if there is going to be some controversy on it. Senator Carstens.

SENATOR CARSTENS: Mr. President I think there is a little confusion come in because looking at some are looking at the bill on page 15, it's the standing committee amendments page 15.

PRESIDENT: Right, and we just discovered that, thank you Senator Carstens.

CLERK: The Standing Committee amendments is the white bill in the bill book, it's a white book in front of the bill. So it's page 15, line 21 to 26.

PRESIDENT: Senator Murphy do you care to be recognized?

SENATOR MURPHY: Yes please. This bill brought something to mind and I have seen one or two others similar to it and I think this very issue develops an objection that I feel should be raised. When this bill was submitted to committee, the bill was printed and read in advance by the committee, when we got to committee the bill had been amended, almost out of sight. The only way to make any sense of it, was of course was to reprint this, and I wonder if there shouldn't be some consideration given to a rule to establish the degree to which a proposed bill can be amended without having it reset for hearing. This bill if you had read the original bill gone to the committee hearing and then were handed this amend-, this stack of amendments, you might just as well not have read the bill in the first place, because it was amended beyond all description, to the point now where even the title doesn't fit. It does not deal with one bank holding company.